

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON**

MATTHEW COTY THEABOLT,

Plaintiff,

v.

**COMMISSIONER SOCIAL SECURITY
ADMINISTRATION,**

Defendant.

Case No. 3:12-cv-01627-SU

**ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND
RECOMMENDATION**

Michael H. Simon, District Judge.

United States Magistrate Judge Patricia Sullivan issued Findings and Recommendation in this case on September 8, 2015. Dkt. 25. Judge Sullivan recommended that the Court grant Plaintiff's Motion for Attorney's Fees under 25 U.S.C. § 406(b) (Dkt. 24). Judge Sullivan further recommended that the Court award counsel \$4,819.84, less any applicable processing fees, because counsel has already been granted EAJA fees. No party has filed objections.

Under the Federal Magistrates Act ("Act"), the court may "accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate." 28 U.S.C.

§ 636(b)(1). If a party files objections to a magistrate's findings and recommendations, "the court shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made." *Id.*; Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3).

If no party objects, the Act does not prescribe any standard of review. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 152 (1985) (“There is no indication that Congress, in enacting [the Act], intended to require a district judge to review a magistrate’s report to which no objections are filed.”); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc) (holding that the court must review de novo magistrate’s findings and recommendations if objection is made, “but not otherwise”).

Although review is not required in the absence of objections, the Act “does not preclude further review by the district judge[] *sua sponte* . . . under a *de novo* or any other standard.” *Thomas*, 474 U.S. at 154. Indeed, the Advisory Committee Notes to Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b) recommend that “[w]hen no timely objection is filed,” the court review the magistrate’s findings and recommendations for “clear error on the face of the record.”

No party having made objections, this Court follows the recommendation of the Advisory Committee and reviews Judge Sullivan’s Findings and Recommendation for clear error on the face of the record. No such error is apparent. Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS** Judge Sullivan’s Findings and Recommendation, Dkt. 25. Plaintiff’s Motion for Attorney’s Fees under 42 U.S.C. § 406(b) (Dkt. 24) is GRANTED. Counsel is awarded \$4,819.84, less any applicable processing fees.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 29th day of September, 2015.

/s/ Michael H. Simon
Michael H. Simon
United States District Judge